DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 166 633 CG 013 248

AUTHOR Garbarino, James; And Others
TITLE Adult Involvement in the Social Maps of Youth: The Transition from Elementary to Secondary School.
PUB DATE Oct 78
NOTE 28p.; Tables may be marginally legible due to print quality

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Community Influence; Developmental Psychology; Friendship; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Junior High School Students; Parent Child Relationship; *Personal Growth; *Social Development; *Socialization

ABSTRACT

The "social maps" of 89 youngsters as they made the transition from sixth to eighth grades (elementary to junior high school) were explored. Data were gathered through interviews with the youngsters in sixth and again in eighth grade. Subjects' mothers were also interviewed at both times. Interviews focused on the child's social network as perceived by the child and by the child's mother. Of special interest were the age and role characteristics of the people named. The results indicate that mothers see more adults in children's social networks than do the children themselves. Both children and their mothers report more adult involvement in eighth grade than in sixth grade. Relatively few differences are attributable to gender, ordinal position, socioeconomic status, family structure, or stage of physical development. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED166633

October 1978

Adult Involvement in the Social Maps of Youth: The Transition from Elementary to Secondary School

James Garbarino,[1] Nancy Burston,[2]
Ann Crouter[2] and Pamela Kops[1]

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Garbarino

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

[1]Center for the Study of Youth Development, Boys Town, Nebraska 68010.

[2]Cornell University, Ithaca, NY. In addition, Suzanne Raber and Robert Russell, also Cornell University were involved in carrying out this study.

CG013248

Adult Involvement in the Social Maps of Youth: The Transition from Elementary to Secondary School

I. Introduction

Bronfenbrenner (1977) identifies several important research perspectives deriving from an ecological view of human development. This report presents an exploratory study that seeks to incorporate two of those perspectives: the importance of a phenomenological orientation in understanding development; and, the concept of "ecological transitions" as a focus for research. It does so in the context of early adolescence, when the interplay of biological and social forces is at a peak.

Our work recognizes the need to address the interplay of objective and subjective realities in shaping the processes and outcomes of human development. This phenomenological approach implies the need to study the "social maps" that both reflect and influence the behavior and development of children. In this study we are exploring the way developmental and environmental differences and changes are related to the social maps of youth, with special emphasis on the role of adults in those maps. The study incorporates an attempt to relate children's maps of their social field to parental perception and evaluation of those relationships. Furthermore, in its examination of change in social networks, the study represents a much needed expansion of work in this field.*

We sought to examine the processes of social mapping in the context of a key "ecological transition," that from elementary to junior high school.** These two settings, the elementary and junior high school,

---

*Glen Elder is one who has criticized the static view adopted by most work on social networks.

**In an earlier paper we presented our first cross-sectional analyses (Garbarino, Burston, Raber, Russell and Crouter, 1978).

typically represent contrasting contexts for behavior and development, as recent work by Blyth, Simmons and Bush (1978) makes clear. The elementary school is typically smaller, thought to be more child-centered, and purports to emphasize more intensive teacher-child relationships. To use the terminology suggested by Bronfenbrenner, it presumably contains more "cross-contextual dyads" than does the junior high school. When we recall that this ecological transition is occurring simultaneously with the maturational events of puberty, its importance as a context for research on the ecology of youth development becomes clear (Garbarino, Note 1).

Our central research questions are these: How does the role of adults in the social maps of children change as the children make the transition from elementary to junior high school? How are these changes mediated by maturational, demographic and socioeconomic factors? The study is designed to shed some light on these substantive questions, while pursuing some of the methodological issues involved in social mapping.

The social environment of American youth and "socialization to adulthood" are continuing concerns for both the professional community and the public at large (Garbarino, 1978; Coleman, 1974). This concern is manifest in research from a variety of perspectives. Orientation and conformity to peers vs. adults has been a prominent topic in the study of adolescence, and the transition from childhood to adolescence (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1970, 1975; Bowerman and Kinch, 1959; Brittain, 1963, 1967; Coleman, 1974; Westley and Elkin, 1956). One popular topic has been the organization of "crowds" and "cliques," as an important aspect of youth culture (e.g., Coleman, 1961; Dunphy, 1963). Emerging from this substantial body of work has been an appreciation for the interplay of factors such as independence strivings within the family and the broader social scene of the adolescent

in shaping development (e.g., Elder, 1968; Kandel and Lesser, 1969). Sociometric work using multivariate approaches to study the relative influence of parents vs. peers (e.g., Condry and Siman, 1974) has added support to the hypothesis that age segregation and the autonomous peer group are significant issues for any understanding of social development, particularly in early adolescence (Hill and Moenks, 1977).

Relating social structure to personality development is a challenge (Elder, 1973). Describing and analyzing the social fields of children is a difficult task. Bronfenbrenner (1977) has argued for a revival of Lewin's (1936; 1951) concept of social mapping as the individual's representation of the environment in cognitive and affective fields. The present study seeks to incorporate this perspective into a sociometric model of social networks borrowed and adapted from the work of anthropologists and sociologists (e.g., Bott, 1971; Cochran and Brassard, in press; Craven and Wellman, 1974; Mitchell, 1967).

To gain an appreciation for the child's social map we first ask the child to identify the people who are salient in the social environment. Only then do we ascertain the "objective" characteristics of those people and their relationships to the child. To complement the child's description we can then ask for a parental assessment of that social field. The congruence of the social map as seen by the parent and the child thus becomes a substantive research issue in its own right. By posing a series of questions designed to elicit a picture of the child's social world as seen by that child, and by then examining the age and role characteristics of that world, we begin to understand the child's interpersonal relationships as the transition to adolescence begins. Such an approach taps important features of the social environment as both a context and a base-

line for assessing development. By replicating the social mapping process a year and a half later we span the transition from sixth to eighth grades, and are afforded a look at changes in those social maps.

In the present study, social networks are viewed as part of the social resources of the child. This conception of networks as resources is salient in American studies of social networks, particularly the social networks of parents (e.g., Brassard, Note 2; Bronfenbrenner and Cochran, Note 3; Cochran and Brassard, in press; Furstenberg, 1976; Garbarino and Sherman, Note 4; Gottlieb, 1977; and Tietjen, Note 5). The current study addresses ecological, socioeconomic and maturational differences in the characteristics of children's social networks, and thus in their social resources. Who knows the child? Who takes an interest in the child? Who does the child feel he or she knows well? How do the parent's and child's answers to these questions correspond? The subjective and objective answers to these questions delineate the child's "social resources." The perceived enduring interest of others, particularly non-familial adults, is believed to be a prime component of a "rich" social environment (Bronfenbrenner, 1970, 1977; Garbarino and Bronfenbrenner, 1976, 1977). The analysis focuses on the role of adults in the child's social network as it is represented in a subjective map of the social environment. Because of the exploratory nature of the study we offer no specific hypotheses about the direction of observed differences. However, the general concern with age segregation and peer orientation would suggest a shift away from adults and towards peers, and we did expect to find evidence of such a shift.

II. Methods

A. Subjects: The study focuses on 89 youngsters from three elementary schools in and around a small Northeastern city. A total of 111 children (60 males and 51 females) were interviewed in sixth grade, but 22 were unavailable in the eighth grade. Moving accounted for 78% of the attrition, and refusal to participate 22%.

B. Interviews: Children were individually interviewed at home using an instrument designed to identify their social maps.* The interviewer protocol reads as follows: "I would like to know about the things that you do with people who are not living in your home. Let's begin by making a list of the people you know best or who know you best, outside your immediate family." In the initial listing the child could name as many people as he or she wished. The child was then asked to review the list and identify the "top ten"--i.e. those known best or knowing the child best. The interviewer made the following statement: "I would like to know a little more about the things you do with the people who are especially important to you. Let us start by picking the ten people who are most important to you. (Interviewer places an X in front of the appropriate names on the list.) What is the relationship of X to you? Does X know any of the other people on your list?"**

Thus, for each of these "top ten," the child reported on their relationship to the child (e.g., peer, adult, institutional representative, relative, etc.), the others among the "top ten" that person knew, and the frequency and context in which the child interacted with the person. In

---

*Copies of all instruments are available from the first author.

**Coding instructions are available from the first author.

supplementary questions the child reported on the number of people to whom he or she could go to for help with a problem. The interviewer asked: "If you needed help with some problem, who do you think would help you?" The questionnaire also examined a variety of social-psychological variables, ranging from self-esteem to dating to victimization. In this report we consider only the data on social maps, with an emphasis on the role of adults. Mothers were also interviewed (in their homes, independently of their children). They also reported on the child's social environment, from their perspective. The same supplementary question was asked of parents as of the children (i.e., people to whom the child could go for help). In addition, mothers were asked to name people outside the family who took an interest in the child.

Background data on the child and the family were collected as part of the interview process. The interviewer rated the child's stage of physical maturation (Preadolescent, Transitional or Early Adolescent) using a three-point scale adapted from an instrument developed by Steinberg (Note 6).

C. Analysis: the analysis addresses five questions, all with reference to the role of adults.

1. Do social maps change significantly during the transition from elementary to secondary school? To answer this question we examined sixth to eighth grade change scores for the following variables.

a. number of people listed overall

b. relational properties of "top ten" listed people

(1) overlap between child and parent's lists

(2) percent of "top ten" who are adults

(3) percent of "top ten" who are institutional representatives such as teachers, coaches, or counselors

(4) the average number of others of the "top ten" known by others (according to the respondent)

(5) the number of adults in the "top ten" who are seen more than once a month

(6) whether or not any adults are listed among the "top ten"

(7) whether or not any institutional representatives are listed among the "top ten"

(8) whether or not any adults are seen more than once a month and are among the "top ten"

These variables tap some of the important aspects of social networks (Cochran and Brassard, in press).

2. Do the children and their parents see the youngster's world differently? Does this change as the child makes the transition from elementary to secondary school? To answer these questions we compared child and parent report data from the nine variables used in the sixth to eighth grade comparisons.

3. Do the characteristics of the child's social map differ across contrasting neighborhoods? To answer this question we examined the nine network variables across the eight neighborhoods from which the youngsters came.

4. Do the characteristics of the child's social map differ across stages of physical maturation? Using the three-point interviewer rating we examined the nine network variables to identify sixth to eighth grade changes.

5. Do the characteristics of the child's social maps differ by socioeconomic level? To answer this question we examined the nine network characteristics and the sixth to eighth grade changes separately for affluent (income $20,000 or more per year) and non-affluent groups.

III. Results

The results are presented as answers to the five questions we posed above.

1. Do social maps change significantly during the transition from elementary to secondary school? Table 1 presents the data to answer this question as well as our second question, so we treat them together.

2. Do the children and their parents see the youngster's world differently? Does this change as the child makes the transition from elementary to secondary school? Table 1 also provides data to answer this question.

Table 1

We answer question #1 in the affirmative. In general, the social maps do change from sixth to eighth grade. The change is generally in the direction of more adult involvement rather than less. We also answer question #2 affirmatively. Children and their parents do see the child's social maps differently. Parents see greater adult involvement than do children and report more adult involvement when their child is in eighth rather than sixth grade. The specific results support this generalizations.

Overall, sixth grade children named more people than did their parents. The mean number listed by children was 13.5 and by their parents was 9.7. Although the mean number of persons listed in eighth grade remainded virtually the same for the children (13.3), parents showed a substantial increase in the mean number of people they listed as knowing their children

(12.3). The "overlap" between child's and parent's list decreased somewhat from sixth to eighth grade (from about 50% to about 40%).

Neither children nor parents were likely to list institutional representatives among their top ten people, although there was a slight increase for both parents and children from sixth to eighth grade, with children going from a mean of 4.4% to 6.0% and parents going from 7.3% to 8.1%.* In sixth grade, parents listed significantly more institutional representatives than did the youngsters.

There was a significant increase in the mean number of adults listed by both parent and child. Children listed a mean of 21.2% in sixth vs. 29.3% in eighth grade. The number of children listing any adults went from 62% in sixth grade to 78% in eighth. Parents listed a mean number of 32.5% adults in sixth and increased to 48.5% in eighth grade. Parents in both grades listed more adults in the "top ten" than their children did: sixth grade child vs. sixth grade parent (21.2 to 32.5); eighth grade child vs. eighth grade parent (29.3 to 48.5). Both children and their parents listed more adults "seen more than once a month" in eighth than sixth grades. Children went from a mean of 1.3 in sixth grade to 1.7 in eighth grade. Parents increased from 1.6 in sixth grade to 2.6 in eighth grade. There were significant differences between parent and child in both sixth and eighth grades: sixth grade child vs. sixth grade parent (1.3 - 1.6); eighth grade child vs. eighth grade parent (1.7 - 2.6).

Increases were also found for children and parents from sixth to eighth grade in the mean number of others known by people on the top ten list.

---

*Note that "top ten" variables are presented as precentages rather than absolute values. This is to adjust for those respondents who did not name ten people in their overall list.

Children increased very slightly (4.5 to 4.7). However, parent increases were significant (3.6 to 4.3). Sixth grade children and their parents differed (4.5 to 3.6), however, in eighth grade there was a large increase in the mean number listed by parents. Thus, the difference between eighth grade child and eighth grade parents was nonsignificant (4.7 to 4.3). One question asked of both child and parent was who would help the child if he/she had a problem. Both children and parents had the same slight decrease from sixth to eighth grade (2.3 to 2.1). The parents were asked to name other people taking an interest in their child. There was a significant decrease between sixth and eighth grade, with a mean of 3.1 in sixth grade to 2.6 in eighth grade. This is particularly interesting in light of the overall increase of adults named to the top ten.

Our sample of 89 children contained 52 males and 38 females. Of the nine dependent variables, significant sex differences were found for two. The difference in the percent of adults listed revealed males gaining 12.6% whereas females gained 2.5%. Sex highly significant in the difference of institutional representatives from sixth to eighth grade, however. Males gained 4.9% while females lost 4.1%. Review of the interviews showed that males named more coaches and scout leaders than females in eighth grade. Family structure yielded no significant findings. There were 74 intact families and 15 single-parent families. Birth order also showed no significant differences between the 29 first borns or only children, and 60 middle or youngest children.

3. Do the characteristics of the child's social map differ across contrasting neighborhoods? Table 2 presents data to answer this question. In these analyses we have five rural, two suburban and one urban neighborhood.

Table 2

Neighborhood differences yielded two significant differences for the sixth grade data but one of these were no longer significant in eighth grade.

For sixth grade children differences in the number of persons listed overall was significant. A rural area listed the most (18.7) and the urban neighborhood listed the least (9.1). In eighth grade there was general movement towards the overall sample mean. This reduced neighborhood variance may indicate the homogenizing effect of the central junior high school.

Parent-child overlap was the only variable to display a significant difference in both sixth and eighth grade. As a whole, overlap decreased from sixth to eighth grade, except for the urban group, where it increased from a 31.6% to 45.5%. Generally speaking, the suburban group had the greatest overlap in sixth and eighth grade.

4. Do the characteristics of the child's social map differ across stage of physical development? Table 3 presents these data. Note that only comparisons between pre-adolescents and transitionals are considered in sixth grade and between transitionals and early adolescents in eighth grade because of the small numbers in the remaining two cells of the design.

Table 3

Physical development differences accounted for little in explaining social network differences. The three variables affected are quite interesting, however. First, for children in sixth grade, there was a significant difference in the percent adults listed. Pre-adolescents listed more adults (29.6) than their counterparts in the transitional stage (17.3). In eighth grade the trend reversed itself, but did not result in a significant difference. Transitionals listed 27.0% and early adolescents 30.5%. Second, in both sixth and eighth grade, the less physically mature groups reported more parent-child overlap, 50.4% vs. 44.8% in sixth grade and 45.9% vs. 40% in eighth grade. Third, in eighth grade, parents of early adolescents report more people who would help the child with a problem than do parents of transitionals.

5. Do the characteristics of the child's social network differ by socioeconomic level? Table 4 provides data to address this question.

Table 4

Social class was broken down into two groups, those making less than $20,000 (N=44) and those making $20,000 or more (N=45). This was done on the basis of preliminary analyses that suggested this dichotomy would provide the clearest contrasts. Affluent parents and their children presented greater overlap in sixth grade (54.2% vs. 40.8%). In eighth grade this difference was replaced by a reversed trend. There was somewhat more overlap among the non-affluent parent-child pairs (44.6%) than there was among the affluent (40.1%). The cross-grade comparisons are significant.

In eighth grade, the number of people who would help the child, according to parents, was greater for the affluent group (2.5) than their

"nonaffluent" counterparts (1.7). There was a marginally significant trend for nonaffluent children to list a greater percentage of adults (25.7% in sixth and 34.5% in eighth) than did affluent (17.2% in sixth and 25.6% in eighth). To go along with this result, nonaffluent parents named more adults who see their kids more than once a month (2.2) than did affluent parents (1.1). In our nonaffluent group of children, 48% gained one or more adults, 30% lost one or more adults and 22% remained the same. By comparison, 29% of the affluent group gained one or more, 25% lost one or more adults and 48% stayed the same.

IV. Discussion

Our results are encouraging if somewhat puzzling. The social mapping approach produced three findings of special interest. First, children and their parents do see the child's world somewhat differently. The most significant difference is in the perceived role of adults in the child's social network. Second, both children and parents see more adults in the child's social network in eighth grade than they did in sixth. This change is greater for parents than for children, despite the initially higher level of adult involvement reported by parents. Third, there are relatively few differences in perceived social networks as a function of demographic, maturational, or socioeconomic factors.

Parents identify more adults in the child's social network than do their children. Of the top ten, parents list an average of 3+ adults in sixth grade and nearly 5 in eighth grade, as compared with 2+ adults in sixth and nearly 3 in eighth grade by their children. By eighth grade nearly all parents were listing at least one adult while nearly twenty percent of the children were still listing none. In general, a parent sees

the child's intimate social world as having more adult involvement than the child does. In both grades parents identify more adults who meet the criteria of knowing the child well and of interacting with the child at least once a month. In sixth grade this difference is small (1.6 vs. 1.3) but in eighth grade it is relatively large (2.6 vs. 1.7).

Both children and their parents identified more adults in eighth grade than they did in sixth grade (an increase from about 2 to about 3 for children and from about 3 to about 5 for parents). This finding is puzzling in light of public and professional concern with peer orientation in early adolescence. We expected to find a decrease in perceived adult involvement from sixth to eighth grade, at least among the children. If the shift toward peer orientation does occur, it must occur after the first half of eighth grade, or occur in some way not tapped by the social mapping approach.

Here we are faced with a parallel to the parent-child discrepancy. Do the shifts in adult involvement in both child's and parent's map of the child's social world reflect actual changes in relationships? Were the changes only among parents or only among children it would be more plausible to hypothesize solely an internal cognitive or affective change. Since the increase in adult involvement is for both groups it suggests some change in external reality. Most plausible in our minds is a real change in the relationships tapped by asking about ". . .the people you know best or who know you best." We suggest the hypothesis that the eighth grade youngster actually does engage in more reciprocal relationships with adults than does the sixth grade youngster. This change is not solely attributable to physical maturation, however. There is no significant difference in perceived adult involvement between early adolescents and transitionals

in eighth grade. In sixth grade the pre-adolescents report more adult involvement than do the transitionals. Moreover, transitionals in eighth grade report more adult involvement than do transitionals in sixth grade.

Why are there so few significant differences in social network characteristics attributable to demographic, maturational or socioeconomic factors? Sex, ordinal position, family intactness and family income are part of "the reliables" when it comes to social science data analysis. Yet our results show a consistent lack of differences attributable to these factors. The lack of differences is most pronounced among the background variables easiest to measure reliably (sex, family structure and ordinal position), so we doubt it is simply an artifact of our data collection. It is consistent with the hypothesis that the ecological transition from sixth to eighth grade has an independent effect on social relationships. Blyth and his colleagues (1978) have found that the junior high school, in contrast to the extended elementary school, fosters more adult-like interests. This may include an increase in the youngster's sense of being involved in relationships with adults.

It may be that children have great latitude in fashioning their social maps because of the social diversity present in most young lives. Conventional social discriminators do not appear to play a preeminent role in that process, at least in the early adolescent period among this sample of "normal" families. The results suggest that children (and their parents) have socially rich pictures of the social world, but that this richness is not highly constricted by the forces that usually shape experience. How accurate those pictures are is a separate issue, of course. In one sense the social maps have face validity as in Tolman's maxim that "situations

perceived as real are real in their consequences." In another sense, however, these maps may not correspond with the child's social relationships as they exist from the perspective of the people named as "well known" by the child and parent. Those who associate with youngsters often experience the problem of becoming an unwitting central figure in a child's life. What is more, their relationship to significant behaviors (such as school success) and developmental outcomes is as yet unknown, although collateral evidence predicts it would be substantial (cf., Cochran and Brassard, in press). At the extreme, impoverished social maps figure prominently in parental inadequacy (Polansky, et al., Note 7) and insufficient coping skills generally (cf., Gottlieb, 1977). Most of the youth in our sample seem to possess sufficient social resource for facing the developmental tasks of adolescence, at least they do "on paper."

Reference Notes

1. Garbarino, J. Adolescent development: an ecological perspective. In L. Montada and H. Oerter (Eds.), Progress in developmental psychology: proceedings of the international seminar on developmental psychology, in press.

2. Brassard, J. The nature and utilization of social networks in families confronting different life circumstances. Unpublished thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 1976.

3. Bronfenbrenner, U., and Cochran, M. The comparative ecology of human development: a research proposal. Cornell University, 1976, mimeo.

4. Garbarino, J. & Sherman, D. Child maltreatment as a research issue in applied community psychology. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada, August, 1978.

5. Tietjen, A.M. Formal and informal support systems: services and social networks in Swedish planned communities. Unpublished thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 1977.

6. Steinberg, L. Research in the ecology of adolescent development: a longitudinal study of the impact of physical maturation on changes in the family system in early adolescence. Paper presented at the Conference on Research Perspectives in the Ecology of Human Development. Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, August 17-20, 1977.

7. Polansky, N., Chalmers, M., Buttenwieser, and Williams, D. The isolation of the neglectful family. Unpublished paper, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1977.

References

Blyth, D., Simmons, R., and Bush, D. The transition into early adolescence: a longitudinal comparison of children in two educational contexts. Sociology of Education, 1978, --.

Bott, E. Family and social network (New York: The Free Press, 1971).

Bowerman, C.E., and Kinch J.W. Changes in family and peer orientation of children between the fourth and tenth grades. Social Forces, 1959, 37, 206-211.

Brim, O.G., Jr. Macro-structural influences on child development and the need for childhood social indicators. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1975, 45, 516-524.

Brittain, C.U. Adolescent choices and parent-peer cross-pressures. American Sociological Review, 1963, 28, 358-391.

Brittain, C.U. An exploration of the bases of peer-compliance and parent-compliance in adolescence. Adolescence, 1967, 2, 445-458.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Toward an experimental ecology of human development. American Psychologist, 1977, --, 513-31.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Two worlds of childhoods (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970).

Bronfenbrenner, U. The origins of alienation In U. Bronfenbrenner and M. Mahoney (eds.) Influence on human development (Hinsdale, Illinois: Dryden Press, 1975, 485-501).

Cochran, M. and Brassard, J. Social networks and social development in children. Child Development, in press.

Coleman, J.S. The adolescent society (New York: The Free Press, 1961).

Coleman, J.S. Youth: transition to adulthood (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974).

Condry, J., and Siman, M. Characteristics of peer- and adult-oriented children. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36, 543-554.

Craven, P., and Wellman, B. The network city In M.P. Effrot (ed.), The community: approaches and applications (New York: The Free Press, 1974).

Dunphy, D.C. The social structure of urban adolescent peer groups. Sociometry, 1963, 26, 230-246.

Elder, G.H. Adolescent socialization and personality development (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968).

Elder, G.H. On linking social structure and personality. American behavioral scientist, 1973, 16, 785-799.

Furstenberg, F. Unplanned parenthood: the social consequences of teenage childbearing, (New York: The Free Press, 1976).

Garbarino, J. The role of schools in socialization adulthood. The Educational Forum, 1978, 42, 169-182.

Garbarino, J., and Bronfenbrenner, U. The socialization of moral judgment and behavior in cross-cultural perspective. In T. Lickona (ed.), Moral development and behavior (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976).

Garbarino, J., and Bronfenbrenner, U. Research on parent-child relations and social policy: how to proceed. Boys Town Center for the Study of Youth Development Working Papers, Series #1, 1977.

Garbarino, J., Burston, N., Raber, S., Russell, R. and Crouter, A. The social maps of children approaching adolescence: studying the ecology of youth development. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1978.

Gottlieb, B. Primary group as supportive milieu: applications to community psychology. Paper presented at the 85th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, California, August, 25-30, 1977.

Hill, J. and Moenks, F. Adolescence and youth in prospect (New York: Humanities Press, 1977).

Kandel, D., and Lesser, G. Parent-adolescent relationships and adolescent independence in the United States and Denmark. Journal of marriage and the family, 1969, 31, 348-358.

Lewin, K. Field theory in social science (New York: Harper, 1951).

Lewin, K. Problems of topological psychology (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1936).

Mitchell, J. Social networks in urban situations (Atlantic Highland, New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1969).

Westley, W.A. and Elkin, F. The protective environment and adolescent socialization. Social Forces, 1956, 35, 243-249.

Table 1: The Social Maps of Youth: Longitudinal Comparisons of Child Reports, Parent Reports and Child-Parent Differences

	6th Grade			8th Grade			8th - 6th Grade		
Characteristics of Social Maps:	Child	Parent	C-P	Child	Parent	C-P	Child	Parent	C-P
Number of Persons Listed Overall	13.5	9.7	3.8***	13.3	12.2	1.1n.s.	-0.2n.s.	2.5***	-2.7**
Of "TOP TEN:"									
Overlap Between Parent & Child List	47.4	53.8	-6.4**	42.2	44.3	-2.1n.s.	-5.2*	-9.5n.s.	+4.3*
Percent Adults	21.2	32.5	-11.3***	29.3	48.5	-19.2***	8.1**	16.***	-7.9*
Percent Inst. Rep.	4.4	7.3	-2.9*	6.0	8.1	-2.1n.s.	1.7n.s.	0.8n.s.	0.9n.s.
Mean # Others Known	4.5	3.6	0.9***	4.7	4.3	0.4#	0.2n.s.	0.7**	-0.5#
# Adults Seen More Than Once Month	1.3	1.6	-0.3*	1.7	2.6	-0.9***	0.4#	1.0**	-0.6#
Percent Listing Adults	62%	79%	-17**	78%	93%	-15**	+16**	+14**	+02
Percent Listing Inst. Rep.	20%	33%	-13*	31%	38%	-07	+21***	+05	+17**
Percent Listing of Adults Seen at Least Once a Month	50%	69%	-19**	60%	81%	-21***	+10	+12*	-02

# $p < .10$
* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$
n.s. not statistically significant

TABLE 2: CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH SOCIAL NETWORKS BY NEIGHBORHOOD

MEANS

Of the ten known best:

	Number of Cases		Total Number of Persons Listed		a. Overlap Between Parent & Child List: Percent		b. Percent Institutional Representative		c. Percent Adult		d. Number of Adults Seen More Than Once a Month		e. Mean Number of Others in List Known		Child & Parent Reports # People Who would Help Child with Problems			
															Child's Report		& Parent's	
NEIGHBORHOOD	6th	8th	6th	8th	6th	8th	6th	8th	6th	8th	6th	8th	6th	8th	6th	8th	6th	8th
1. Ruralville (Rural)	7	8	14.7	14.1	41.3	36.2	4.3	11.2	26.4	43.8	2.1	2.9	4.6	4.8	3.0	1.9	2.9	1.5
2. Folkville (Rural)	15	13	18.7	15.5	45.0	41.7	5.0	3.3	20.1	26.0	1.1	1.4	5.3	4.5	2.3	1.6	2.1	2.5
3. Farmville (Rural)	6	7	15.3	12.3	39.5	29.7	5.0	1.4	21.7	22.3	1.8	0.4	5.5	4.4	2.3	2.0	2.5	2.4
4. Midville (Rural)	6	6	12.0	14.3	27.5	28.2	0	9.0	5.0	29.5	0.5	1.5	5.5	5.4	2.2	1.7	1.6	2.0
5. Countryside (Rural)	20	22	13.2	13.2	49.3	39.7	4.0	7.7	19.6	24.0	1.3	1.8	4.1	5.2	2.2	2.3	2.1	2.4
6. Richville (Suburban)	20	20	10.3	11.7	61.0	55.5	1.0	4.0	17.0	26.7	0.7	1.0	4.0	4.1	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.0
7. Collegeville (Suburban)	9	8	14.6	12.7	52.7	41.6	11.4	7.9	38.7	41.0	1.8	1.9	4.4	4.6	2.7	2.6	2.6	1.7
8. Downtown (Urban)	7	6	9.1	14.2	31.6	45.5	8.9	4.5	26.3	42.7	2.0	3.2	3.9	5.7	1.4	2.3	2.3	1.8
OVERALL MEAN			13.5	13.3	47.4	42.2	4.4	6.0	21.2	29.7	1.3	1.6	4.5	4.8	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.1
Significance of differences:			#	n.s.	**	**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

p less than .10
* p less than .05
** p less than .01

TABLE 3: CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH SOCIAL NETWORKS BY STAGE OF PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT

			MEANS															
			Of the ten known best:															
	Number of Cases		Total Number of Persons Listed		a. Overlap Between Parent & Child List: Percent		b. Percent Institutional Representative		c. Percent Adult		d. Number of Adults Seen More Than Once a Month		e. Mean Number of Others in List Known		Child & Parent Reports # People Who would Help Child with Problems			
																	Child's Report & Parent's	
Physical Development Stage	6th	8th	6th	8th	6th	8th	6th	8th	6th	8th	6th	8th	6th	8th	6th	8th	6th	8th
Preadolescent	31	1	13.7		50.4		5.2		29.6		1.6		4.0		2.6		2.6	
Transitional	55	28	13.3	12.0	44.8	45.9	4.3	6.9	17.2	27.0	1.1	1.4	4.8	4.3	2.2	2.2	2.1	1.7
Early Adolescent	4	59		14.0		40.0		5.6		30.5		1.8		5.0		2.1		2.3
Difference			- .4	+2.0	+5.6*	+5.9*	+.9	+1.3	12.4**	3.5	.5	-.4	-.8	-.7	.4	.1	.5	-.6*

* $p > .05$
** $p > .01$

TABLE 4: CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH SOCIAL NETWORKS BY SOCIAL CLASS

Social Class	Number of Cases		MEANS Total Number of Persons Listed			Of the ten known best: a. Overlap Between Parent & Child List: Percent			b. Percent Institutional Representative			c. Percent Adult			d. Number of Adults Seen More Than Once a Month			e. Mean Numbe of Others in List Known	
	6th	8th	6th	8th	8-6	6th	8th	8-6	6th	8th	8-6	6th	8th	8-6	6th	8th	8-6	6th	8th
1. (Nonaffluent) below $20,000	44	44	13.7	13.9	+.2	40.8	44.6	+3.8	5.1	5.7	+1.6	25.7	34.5	+8.8	2.1	2.2	+1.9	1.7	1.9
2. (Affluent) above $20,000	45	45	13.3	13.0	-.3	54.2	40.1	-14.1	3.8	6.3	+2.5	17.2	25.6	+8.4	1.9	1.1	+3.8	1.0	1.6
OVERALL MEAN			13.5	13.4		47.6	42.3		4.5	6.0		21.5	30.0		1.5	1.7		1.3	1.8
Nonaffluent-Affluent			.4	.9	.7	-13.4**	4.5	17.9**	1.3	-.6	1.9	8.5#	8.9#	.4	-.8#	1.1**	5.7#	.7*	.3

p > .10
* p > .05
** p > .01

Child & Parent
Reports # People
Who would Help
Child with Problems

Child's Report & Parent's

5-6	6th	8th	5-6	6th	8th	5-6
	2.4	2.1		2.4	1.7	
+3.2			-.3			-.7
	2.2	2.2		2.2	2.5	
+3.6			.0			+.3
	2.3	2.1		2.3	2.1	
-.4	.2	-.1	-.3	.2	-.8**	-.10**